

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

BENNIE L. COLLINS,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 6:20-cv-277
	§	
MANAGEMENT TRAINING	§	
CORPORATION, et al.,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On July 31, 2020, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 18), recommending that the action be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution and failure to obey an order of the court.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge *de novo* only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a *de novo* review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Plaintiff did not file objections in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews his legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a

Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. The Court therefore adopts the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 18) as the findings of this Court. The Court notes that the Report and Recommendation sent to Plaintiff was returned as undeliverable. Docket No. 19. However, Plaintiff did receive the previous order requiring amendment of his complaint and has not complied. Docket No. 17. Further, under Local Rule CV-11(d), "[a] *pro se* litigant must provide the court with a physical address (i.e., a post office box is not acceptable) and is responsible for keeping the clerk advised in writing of his or her current physical address." It appears Plaintiff has failed to properly update his address.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report (Docket No. 18) is **ADOPTED**. It is further **ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for want of prosecution and failure to obey an order of the court. All motions not previously ruled on are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **27th** day of **August, 2020**.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE